

Village of Carol Stream

AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING-PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2022 AT 6:00 P.M.

ALL MATTERS ON THE AGENDA MAY BE DISCUSSED, AMENDED AND ACTED UPON

- I. Roll Call: Present:
Absent:
- II. Approval of Minutes: August 22, 2022
- III. Presentation:
22-0042 – Bridge Street Properties, LLC – 1475 W. Lies Road
Courtesy Review – Duplex Development Proposed
- IV. Old Business:
- V. New Business:
- VI. Report of Officers:
- VII. Adjournment:

**Regular Meeting – Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals
Gregory J. Bielawski Municipal Center, DuPage County, Carol Stream, Illinois**

***All Matters on the Agenda may be Discussed, Amended and Acted Upon
August 22, 2022.***

Chairman Parisi called the Regular Meeting of the Combined Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 6:00 p.m. and directed Patty Battaglia, Planning and Permitting Assistant, to call the roll.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Present: 5 Commissioners Battisto, Meneghini, Morris, Tucek and Chairman Parisi

Absent: 2 Commissioners Christopher and Petella

Also Present: Tom Farace, Planning and Economic Development Manager; Patty Battaglia, Planning and Permitting Assistant; a representative from County Court Reporters via Zoom

MINUTES:

Commissioner Battisto moved and Commissioner Tucek seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting held on June 27, 2022.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 3 Commissioners Battisto, Tucek and Chairman Parisi

Nays: 0

Abstain: 2 Commissioners Meneghini and Morris

Absent: 2 Commissioners Christopher and Petella

The motion passed by a majority vote.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Chairman Parisi asked for a motion to open the Public Hearing. Commissioner Meneghini moved and Commissioner Morris seconded the motion.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Battisto, Meneghini, Morris, Tucek and Chairman Parisi

Nays: 0

Abstain: 0

Absent: 2 Commissioners Christopher and Petella

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Case #21-0056– Geneva Crossing Phase II – 440 Main Place

Amendment to a Special Use Permit for a Planned Development, Plat of Resubdivision

Chairman Parisi swore in Mr. Dave Scheffler, owner, and his attorney, Mr. Richard Guerard, and asked them to give their presentation.

Mr. Scheffler stated he is the owner of a six acre parcel which was previously subdivided and now I'm looking to resubdivide this parcel into two lots and an out lot for a water detention facility.

Chairman Parisi asked if there were any comments or questions from the audience and there were none.

Chairman Parisi asked Mr. Farace to provide a Staff Report.

Mr. Farace stated Mr. Scheffler is seeking an amendment to the Geneva Crossing Phase II planned development plan and a plat of resubdivision. This property was annexed into the village in 1996/1997 for Phase I which was the shopping center. Phase II is proposed to be subdivided into 3 lots (2 lots with the third lot being a detention facility on the west part of the property). Staff has reviewed the request and are recommending approval with the conditions listed on the Staff Report.

Chairman Parisi asked if there were any comments or questions from the Commission.

Commissioners Battisto, Morris, Tucek and Chairman Parisi had no questions, but Commissioner Meneghini asked Mr. Scheffler if he was familiar with the conditions listed and if he would comply.

Mr. Scheffler replied he read them and agreed to them.

Commissioner Meneghini moved and Commissioner Tucek seconded the motion with no further discussion.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Battisto, Meneghini, Morris, Tucek and Chairman Parisi
Nays:	0	
Abstain:	0	
Absent:	2	Commissioners Christopher and Petella

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

This case will go before the Village Board on Tuesday, September 6, 2022, at 6:00 PM for review.

Case #22-0001 – Belle Tire – 490 Main Place

Amendment to a Special Use Permit for a Planned Development, Special Use Permit for Auto Repair and Service

Chairman Parisi swore in Mr. Christopher Enright, Architect, and asked him to give his presentation.

Mr. Enright stated he is the architect representing Belle Tire. It is an automotive retailer that offers some minor repair work. We currently have 16 locations open in the Chicagoland area and are looking to open

60 more. All work is performed inside the building. No work is done outside and no cars are stored outside the building as well. The building is brick material with some masonry work.

Chairman Parisi asked if there were any comments or questions from the audience and there were none.

Chairman Parisi asked Mr. Farace to provide a Staff Report.

Mr. Farace stated Belle Tire is proposed to be located in Lot 1 of the resubdivision of Lot 3 within Geneva Crossing Phase II. It is a little under 1.5 acres and can be accessed by a drive aisle that leads into Geneva Crossing Shopping Center. The building itself is about 9,800 square feet with two driveways; one along Main Place will be shared with whatever is developed in Lot 2 and the other leads in from the south along the drive aisle that leads into the shopping center. Parking is proposed on the north, south and east sides of the building and exceeds the requirements as stated in the UDO. The landscape plan meets the majority of the regulations except for the south side of the building where the overhead doors are located. Belle Tire proposed they would landscape on the north foundation building side which is not required per code, and have an over abundance of landscaping on the other sides. Building elevations are nicely designed with a tower feature at the southeast corner of the building. Signage will also meet the requirements of the UDO. Staff is supportive of the requests with the conditions listed on the Staff Report.

Chairman Parisi asked if there were any comments or questions from the audience and there were none.

Chairman Parisi asked if there were any comments or questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Morris asked if this business was company owned or a franchise.

Mr. Enright replied the entire chain is singularly owned by the Barns family.

Commissioner Meneghini asked if Mr. Enright was familiar with the conditions listed and if he would comply.

Mr. Enright stated yes sir, I am.

Commissioners Battisto, Tucek and Chairman Parisi had no questions.

Commissioner Morris moved and Commissioner Meneghini seconded the motion with no further discussion.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Battisto, Meneghini, Morris, Tucek and Chairman Parisi

Nays: 0

Abstain: 0

Absent: 2 Commissioners Christopher and Petella

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

This case will go before the Village Board on Tuesday, September 6, 2022, at 6:00 PM for review.

Case #22-0013 – Tyndale House Ministries – 504 S. Schmale Road*Zoning Map Amendment, Amendment to a Special Use Permit for a Planned Development, Plat of Consolidation*

Chairman Parisi swore in Mr. Eric Prechtel and asked him to give his presentation.

Mr. Prechtel stated he is here on behalf of Tyndale requesting an amendment to the planned development, rezoning from the B-3 General Business District to the O-S Office Service District, approval of a Plat of Consolidation and Site Plan, and modification of a 40 foot rear, back yard setback. This is Tyndale's corporate headquarters and they finished their first building on the property in 1984. They are one of the largest independent Christian publishers in the world and I believe the largest in the United States. They've done several expansions on the property with the most recent one done in 2000. They employ roughly 245 people at this location and the current property is 14 acres and they are looking to purchase the land directly to the south, from Mr. Scheffler, which is an additional 1.4 acres and looking to expand their warehouse to the south. The proposed expansion is 53,000 square feet. Since the property on the east side is oddly shaped, we are proposing a setback variation of 30 feet. The addition will continue to be brick like the existing warehouse and the proposed landscaping far exceeds the requirements.

Chairman Parisi asked for questions from the audience and there were none so Mr. Farace was asked to provide a Staff Report.

Mr. Farace stated Lot 1 within Geneva Crossing Phase II is being proposed to be purchased by Tyndale and then consolidated with the main Tyndale lot itself. Since the addition is going to straddle both lots, a portion will be developed initially within the phase two development, but the lots are proposed to be consolidated and rezoned to the Office and Service District (O-S) which is the current zoning for the main Tyndale property. The addition will include the removal of approximately 60 parking spaces on the south end. But there will be a surplus of 100 parking spaces (even with the loss of the 60) which is more than adequate. The landscaping more than meets the UDO requirements. However, Staff felt it was important to provide screening to the east of the addition where the Goddard School's parking lot is located. The evergreens along with the 6 foot tall, board-on-board fence will provide adequate screening. The docks will be located on the northwest side of the addition and aligned with the existing docks. Both existing and proposed docks will be located several hundred feet away from the neighboring residents on West Street. This is probably the nicest warehouse building in town and the addition will match the existing building. Also, Staff feels comfortable supporting the 30 feet setback from 40 feet. Overall, Staff feels comfortable with the proposed recommendations with the conditions listed on the Staff Report.

Chairman Parisi asked if there were any comments or questions from the audience and there were none.

Chairman Parisi asked if there were any comments or questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Tucek asked Mr. Prechtel if there was fencing currently.

Mr. Prechtel replied we do not currently have fencing.

Commissioner Tucek asked why are we putting up the fence.

Mr. Farace stated it is a requirement in the Unified Development Ordinance which states if you have transition areas, and depending on what the adjacent uses are, that determines the size of your transition area. Because this is an Industrial Use next to a Commercial Use that makes it a requirement from a screening perspective.

Commissioner Tucek commented on a 6 foot fence next to a 30 foot building.

Commissioner Battisto wanted to clarify that we did not get audience questions and we did ask for them to make sure they had an opportunity to speak.

Commissioners Meneghini, Morris and Chairman Parisi had no questions.

Commissioner Meneghini moved and Commissioner Tucek seconded the motion with no further discussion.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Battisto, Meneghini, Morris, Tucek and Chairman Parisi

Nays: 0

Abstain: 0

Absent: 2 Commissioners Christopher and Petella

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

This case will go before the Village Board on Tuesday, September 6, 2022, at 6:00 PM for review.

22-0028 – Route 64, LLC (Cooper) – 27W174 North Avenue and 2N441 County Farm Road
Amendments to Special Use Permits, Zoning Variation

Chairman Parisi asked if the petitioner was present and Mr. Farace stated they would not be because they have withdrawn their zoning request because the properties are on the market. They do have a previous annexation agreement that needs to be amended because there were certain stipulations in that agreement. Since they are selling the property, this is no longer necessary, and that will be reviewed at a future Village Board meeting.

Commissioner Parisi asked if the property was annexed into Carol Stream.

Mr. Farace stated it was annexed in and we adopted separate ordinances for their zoning approvals and the rezoning request. The rezoning will stand and the zoning approvals will go away.

22-0035 – Village of Carol Stream – 500 N. Gary Avenue
Zoning Text Amendment – Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) – Miscellaneous Modifications

Chairman Parisi swore in Mr. Farace and asked him to present the proposed modifications.

Mr. Farace stated the following sections need to be further refined:

- Definition and use term for “microbrewery” to remove the off-site consumption provision from the definition
- Maximum lot coverage requirements are established within all residential zoning districts, typically up to 30% of the lot. A provision to allow an increase to maximum lot coverage up to 35% for residential properties, for decks and swimming pools only, was inadvertently left out of the UDO. Staff proposes to include the code language again.
- Update code to specify the type of material required for outdoor storage areas
- Correct some typos for the Planned Development and Accessory Structure section which had the wrong letter and number as highlighted in the Staff Report

- Fence regulations revert to previous regulations (not requiring a shadow-box style, cedar or pretreated wood) on residential through lots or major roadways (with the exception of chain link fencing).

Staff is looking for a recommendation to move forward with these changes.

Chairman Parisi asked for any questions from the audience and there were none.

Chairman Parisi asked for questions or comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Tucek stated the shadow box fences are the standard the Village wants to get to so is that what you are talking about that it will take years and years and do you want everybody to have shadow box at one time.

Mr. Farace stated the shadow box style is currently the code and now being recommended is not having a specific style or material except for chain link.

Commissioner Tucek commented he thinks we are taking a step backwards in relation to the fences. If we do not aim for consistency now, we will never get there. If there is no consistency, what are we really achieving-nothing. I would like to see the requirement stay so we can eventually see the consistency.

Chairman Parisi stated if we revert to the code prior to the UDO, you won't have the aesthetically pleasing look. It may take 20 years, but it will look nice. He then asked how this proposed change came about.

Mr. Farace stated Staff discusses requirements for a fence permit with residents and contractors and we received some concerns from residents that are not interested in installing the required style fence and they have voiced their concern with elected officials. The thought was it was a great idea and may take some time to see the new fences along those major roadways, but in hindsight, maybe it is more of a concern that outweighs what the overall improvement might be.

Commissioner Battisto stated it appears we get complaints from both sides – not enough regulations or consistencies or people who want to do their own fencing products. If we are going to set a standard, we need to have more input from the people in the Village because they clearly did not like the shadow box style as the standard. Maybe it can be a step process. Instead of going from whatever you want to one type, possibly suggest a few choices.

Chairman Parisi stated he would have to support the original UDO. It would be interesting to define the Village aesthetically which would happen over time and have the overall outcome and someone would be thanking us down the road. It is unfortunate, but I can see Commissioner Battisto's point as to why would we dictate to a resident what type of fence they should have and the expenses involved.

Commissioner Meneghini stated he agrees with Commissioner Battisto that I don't want to be dictated to. I can appreciate consistency and aesthetics, but I'm getting to old to think about what to do, what to use and how to do it.

Chairman Parisi asked for further questions or comments from the Commission and there were none.

Mr. Farace commented that most of the Commission members said other code amendments that were proposed there were no issues with them. So if the Commission wanted to divide them into

two recommendations for all of the other proposed text amendments and then the fence text amendment, or you can put it all under one.

Chairman Parisi asked for a motion.

Commissioner Battisto moved and then an audience member asked if he could speak.

Chairman Parisi stated not at this point. There was an opportunity earlier unless the Commission will allow it I'm willing to make an exception in this case.

Commissioner Meneghini stated he would like to hear what some of our residents may have to say at this point and request you make an exception in this case Mr. Chairman.
Chairman Parisi asked if there were any other objections and there were none.

Mr. Anthony Giambrone, owner of 917 Sorrel Court, stated he wanted to put up a vinyl fence and was told he had to have a shadow box, wood fence. I am getting older and don't have the strength to stain or maintain that type of fence and want something that will last 100 years. The fence company said that type of fence will last 100 years so it will take that long for those to be replaced. We started a petition and received many signatures that it should be our choice what type of fence we want. In none of our lifetimes are we going to see all those fences be the same, ever. So I want to know why I can't put the fence that matches all my neighbors' fences and is the kind I want.

Chairman Parisi stated that question would go to the Board. We are a recommending body and our recommendations will go the Village Board. The Village Board will decide to make the amendment to the UDO.

Commissioner Battisto asked out of curiosity if the resident is bothered to see no consistency on the fence that runs along the roadways.

Mr. Giambrone replied no, as long as they are neat looking, not falling down or having things holding them up.

Commissioner Battisto also asked if it would surprise you that there are neighbors of yours that live on Lies and County Farm that disagree with you and want consistency.

Mr. Giambrone stated but we are never going to see it.

Commissioner Battisto stated I am not disagreeing with you, I'm just raising the issue with you that we are currently wrestling with.

Mr. Giambrone stated if the Village made everybody take all their fences down and put all of the same up right now I would go along with that. But we'll never see that. There are so many different types of people and different kinds of fencing, how do you tell people they have to have one kind. That's like me telling you everybody has to get their haircut the same way. It's not going to happen. Grass is perfect and my house looks nice. I just want to put up a fence that is going to last longer.

Chairman Parisi asked for any other comments from the Commission and there were none.

Commissioner Battisto moved and Commissioner Meneghini seconded the motion with no further discussion.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 3 Commissioners Battisto, Meneghini, Morris
Nays: 2 Commissioner Tucek and Chairman Parisi
Abstain: 0
Absent: 2 Commissioners Christopher and Petella

The motion passed by majority vote.

This case will go before the Village Board on Tuesday, September 6, 2022, at 6:00 PM for review.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Chairman Parisi asked for a motion to close the Public Hearing. Commissioner Morris moved and Commissioner Tucek seconded the motion.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Battisto, Meneghini, Morris, Tucek and Chairman Parisi
Nays: 0
Abstain: 0
Absent: 2 Commissioners Christopher and Petella

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

NEW BUSINESS:

OLD BUSINESS:

OTHER BUSINESS:

ADJOURNMENT:

At 6:58 p.m. Commissioner Battisto moved and Commissioner Meneghini seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Battisto, Meneghini, Morris, Tucek and Chairman Parisi
Nays: 0
Abstain: 0
Absent: 2 Commissioners Christopher and Petella

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

FOR THE COMBINED BOARD

Recorded and transcribed by,

Patty Battaglia
Planning and Permitting Assistant

Minutes approved by Plan Commission on this ____ day of _____, 20____.

Chairman

Village of Carol Stream Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals

STAFF REPORT

September 12, 2022

TO:
Chairman and Plan Commissioners

FROM:
Community Development
Department

CASE MANAGER:
Tom Farace, Planning & Economic
Development Manager

ACTION REQUESTED:
Courtesy Review for 38-unit duplex
development proposal, in
accordance with Section 16-8-4 (G)
of the UDO

APPLICANT/ CONTACT:
Mr. John McHale
Bridge Street Properties, LLC
P.O. Box 5726
Naperville, IL 60567

CASE #: 22-0042

PROJECT NAME: Bridge Street Properties, LLC / 1475 W. Lies
Road



John McHale, President with Bridge Street Properties, LLC, in Naperville, has requested a courtesy review for a proposed residential development at the northeast corner of Lies and Fair Oaks Roads. The purpose of the courtesy review process, which was established with the development of the UDO, is to offer a developer informal feedback regarding a proposed development from the recommending and decision-making bodies of the Village. The proposal will also be reviewed by the Village Board at an upcoming meeting.



For Informal Feedback

Attachments

Attached for review is the General Application, Project Description Letters, Conceptual Site Plan (Exhibit A), and Building Elevation Examples (Exhibit B).

Project Summary

- Mr. McHale proposes to annex nine acres of unincorporated land at the northeast corner of Lies and Fair Oaks Roads into the Village, for the development of a 38-unit duplex project. The property is adjacent to Corpus Christi Church (zoned R-1 Estate Residence and Community Facilities District) to the east, and the Slepicka Farm single-unit detached residential subdivision (zoned R-3 Suburban Residence District) to the south. Unincorporated single-unit detached residences are located north of the property, and land owned by the Forest Preserve is located west of the property.
- The Future Land Use Plan within the 2016 Village Comprehensive Plan calls for single-unit residential development should the property be annexed into Carol Stream. It should be noted that a single-unit detached residence, or single-family home, is defined in the UDO as “a dwelling containing one dwelling unit only which is surrounded on all sides by open space on the same lot.” A duplex is considered a “single-unit attached” residence, which is defined by the UDO as “a dwelling designed to contain one dwelling unit from lowest level to roof, with a private outside entrance, but not necessarily occupying a private lot, and sharing a common wall adjoining dwelling units.” Mr. McHale indicates in his project description letter that maintenance-free residential products have been growing in popularity each year, and a duplex development will allow for maintenance-free residences with a limited increase to allowable density on the property as compared to a townhouse development.
- As indicated, 38 duplexes are proposed within 19 buildings, with an entrance to the development proposed on Lies Road. Density for the proposal equates to approximately 4.22 units per acre. As a point of reference, the density for the Central Park duplex development at Kuhn Road and Central Park Drive is 4.81 units per acre.
- Since the plan is conceptual in nature, in-depth plans and information on landscaping, utilities, detention, roadway configuration, building architecture, and site layout and amenities have not been submitted at this time. However, the conceptual site plan illustrates areas proposed for stormwater management purposes, and an example of an exterior duplex building elevation has been submitted.
- Should the project move forward, the following approvals will be required:
 - Rezoning upon annexation to R-4 Multi-Unit Residence District
 - Special Use Permit for a Multi-Unit Complex
 - Possible Special Use Permit for a Planned Development (if developed as a PD)

Next Steps

Mr. McHale is looking for feedback for the PC/ZBA regarding the duplex development proposal on the unincorporated property prior to making a decision whether to move forward with a formal submittal for the project.



RECEIVED
AUG 29 2022
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPT

Do Not Write in This Space
Date Submitted: 8-29-22
Fee Submitted: \$240.00
File Number: 22-0042
Meeting Date: 9/12/22
Public Hearing Required:

Village of Carol Stream

500 N. Gary Avenue ▪ Carol Stream, IL 60188

PHONE 630.871.6230 ▪ FAX 630.665.1064

www.carolstream.org

FORM A

GENERAL APPLICATION PUBLIC HEARINGS AND DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL REQUESTS

1. Name of Applicant Bridge Street Properties, LLC Phone 630-710-9490
 Address P.O. Box 5726 Naperville, IL 60540 Fax 630-281-4085
 E-Mail Address jmchale@bridgestreetproperty.com
 (required)
 Name of Attorney _____ Phone _____
 (if represented)
 Address _____ Fax _____
 Name of Owner John Chew Phone 847-678-7023
 (required if other than applicant)
 Address 28893 N Garland Rd Wauconda, IL 60084 Fax _____
 Name of Architect _____ Phone _____
 (if applicable)
 Address _____ Fax _____

2. *Common Address/Location of Property _____

3. Requested Action: (check all that apply)
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Annexation | <input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision – Minor/Major |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Courtesy Review | <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary Waiver/Code of Ordinances |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Development Staff Review | <input type="checkbox"/> Variation – Zoning (requires Form B-1) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gary/North Avenue Corridor Review | <input type="checkbox"/> Variation – Sign (requires Form B-2) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Planned Development – Final | <input type="checkbox"/> Variation – Fence (requires Form B-3) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Planned Development – Preliminary | <input type="checkbox"/> Special Use Permit (requires Form C) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Shared Parking Facility | <input type="checkbox"/> Map Amendment (requires Form D-1) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan Review | <input type="checkbox"/> Text Amendment (requires Form D2) |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Adjustment (requires Form E) |

Describe requested action _____

Would like to hold a courtesy review with the village to discuss the redevelopment of the NE Corner of Lies Rd and Fair Oaks Rd. Would like to annex the property into the Village of Carol Stream with a residential duplex development

4. Fee Schedule: (Check all that apply)

Total Application Fee: \$ 240.00

	Annexation approvals:	
	New development	\$2,000
	Other	\$800
	Annexation Agreement Amendment	\$800
	Appearance fee for approvals required by the UDO but not listed herein	\$500
X	Courtesy Review	\$240
	Development Staff Review	\$640
	Easement Encroachment	\$300
	Gary/North Avenue Corridor Review:	
	New or replacement monument sign	\$500
	One discipline (site design, architecture or landscaping)	\$500
	Two disciplines	\$1,000
	Three disciplines	\$1,500
	New development	\$1,500
	Outdoor Dining Permit	\$120
	Planned Development:	
	Existing Planned Development, minor change	\$500
	Existing Planned Development, major change	\$1,000
	New Planned Development	\$1,500
	Rezoning (Zoning Map Amendment)	\$640
	Shared Parking Facility Permit	\$500
	Site Plan Review	\$640
	Special Use:	
	First	\$800
	Each additional	\$200
	Special Use Amendment	\$800
	Staff Adjustment	\$240
	Subdivision:	
	Major	\$700
	Minor	\$400
	Temporary Building, Structure or Use	\$120
	Temporary Waiver to the Code of Ordinances	\$120
	Text Amendment:	
	Building Codes	\$240
	Unified Development Ordinance	\$640
	Variation:	
	First	\$640
	Each additional	\$200
	Zoning verification letter	\$80

5. Applicant Certification

*I authorize the Village of Carol Stream to install a temporary sign or signs on the property having the common address indicated in Item 2 on this form, for the purpose of notifying the public of the upcoming public hearing, once the hearing has been scheduled.

I have reviewed a copy of the informational handout(s) for the zoning process(es) for which I am making an application. I am familiar with the code requirements which relate to this application and I certify that this submittal is in conformance with such code(s).

I understand that incomplete or substandard submittals may increase the staff review time and delay scheduling of the public hearing. I also understand that, per § 6-13-6 of the Municipal Code, the Village's costs of legal reviews, structural engineering review, and other special reviews determined to be necessary by the Community Development Director, performed by means of consultant services, shall be paid at the billed rate to the Village by the applicant.

John McHale

Print Name

Signature

08/26/2022

Date

Revised 07/21



RECEIVED
AUG 29 2022
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPT

August 29, 2022

Mr. Tom Farace
Planning & Economic Development Manager
Village of Carol Stream
500 N. Gary Avenue
Carol Stream IL 60188

RE: NE corner of Lies Rd. & Fair Oaks Rd.

Dear Tom,

Thank you and the village for the opportunity to submit our plan for the NE corner of Lies and Fair Oaks Rds. for a courtesy review. Bridge Street Properties, LLC. is the contract purchaser of the 9-acre piece described above. After initial conversations with my engineering group and staff at the village, I would like to present a current plan for review.

Briefly, I would like to describe to you, my background. I am a builder/developer based in Naperville, IL since 2004. I have been involved in the acquisition, entitlement, development and construction of numerous single family and multi family projects in the Chicagoland market. I am happy to provide you a list of completed projects at your request.

Attached is my concept plan and description for the 9-acre parcel that we discussed. Please let me know if you have any further questions. I look forward to discussing this with you further.

Best,

John McHale
Bridge Street Properties, LLC.

P.O. Box 5726
Naperville, IL 60567
Phone (630)334-9490 Fax (630)281-4085
dmchale@bridgestreetproperty.com

RECEIVED
AUG 29 2022
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPT

Concept Plan

NE Corner of Lies Rd. and Fair Oaks Rd.

Bridge Street Properties, LLC. is the contract purchaser of the approximately 9 acres on the NE corner of Lies and Fair Oaks Rds. We would be looking to annex the property into the Village of Carol Stream and are showing a concept plan of Duplex homes for the site. The site would encompass 19 buildings totaling 38 for sale duplexes. With the proximity of the site to an intersection of two busy roads, we feel that a multi-family product would be more inline with current planning and market needs. It would allow the duplexes to act as a transition from the busy intersection on the corner to the single family homes to the North and Corpus Christi Church to the East.

The site also has the benefit of being across Fair Oaks Road from the 700+ acre West Branch Forest Preserve, allowing the residents to use the proximity of the West Branch as a neighborhood park. The bike paths would also allow for the residents to explore more of Carol Stream and DuPage County.

The need in the marketplace for maintenance free product grows every year. The market shows that more people would like to have the advantage of a maintenance free lifestyle vs. the upkeep of a home. The duplexes would allow for this without the extra density of a townhouse community. We feel that this would be a great fit for the village.

Attached is one front elevation for discussion purposes of the type of home that would be built on the site.

CAROL STREAM SITE PLAN

RECEIVED

AUG 29 2022

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPT



Job Number: 847.014



SITE DATA	
A. TOTAL AREA	9.00 AC.
B. UNITS	38
C. DENSITY	4.22 DU/AC.
D. FRONT YARD SETBACK	25 FT.
E. CORNER SIDE YARD SETBACK	25 FT.
F. REAR YARD SETBACK	30 FT.
G. INTERIOR SIDE YARD SETBACK	7.5 FT.


BRIDGE STREET PROPERTIES

P.O. BOX 5726

NAPERVILLE, ILLINOIS 60567

(630)281-4085

EXHIBIT A



RECEIVED

AUG 29 2022

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPT



EXHIBIT B